

5630

Little
P.L. II

DECISION



**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548**

FILE: B-190825

DATE: March 10, 1978

MATTER OF: Ronald Campbell Company

DIGEST:

1. Solicitation requiring "all or none" bidding is proper where needs of the Government require that small dollar value contract for periodical subscriptions not be handled on piecemeal basis.
2. Use of fixed-price payment term for periodical subscription contract rather than cost reimbursement payment term is reasonable in view of low value of contract and increased burden of administering cost reimbursement contract.

Ronald Campbell (Campbell) protests against the terms of IFB F04626-78-B0009 issued November 16, 1977, by the Air Force which provides for an all or none award of a fixed-price contract for one year's subscription to 245 separate medical periodicals.

Campbell points out that many of the periodicals to be supplied are foreign and that anyone bidding would be taking a risk that the U.S. dollar would not hold its value long enough for the awardee to contract for the foreign periodicals at a profit. Campbell states that, in view of the generally declining value of the U.S. dollar, the risk would be too great for any prudent bidder to take. Consequently, Campbell requests that bidding be allowed on less than all of the items or that offerors be allowed to submit offers for the whole requirement on a cost reimbursable basis.

The Air Force states that the main reason for requiring "all or none" bids was that allowing partial offers for 245 subscriptions would result in an unreasonable administrative burden on Air Force personnel having to piece such offers together. In addition, Air Force states there

B-190825

would be no assurance that all of the items needed would be bid upon. In these circumstances we have no reason to question that determination. 53 Comp. Gen. 270 (1973).

Campbell also argues that if the bids cannot be for less than the total, then the contract should be on a cost reimbursement basis.

In reply Air Force states that a number of responsive bidders on all items indicates the presence of competition. We note, however, that only one responsive bid (the low bid) was submitted. (The other bidders failed to bid on one or more of the items. Garamond Pride-mark Press, B-182664, February 25, 1975, 75-1 CPD 106.) However, we can find no fault with the Air Force's determination to use a fixed-price contract for the instant procurement. As the Air Force points out, the burden of administering a cost type contract is greater than that required in the case of a fixed-price contract. In view of the low dollar value of the instant contract, we think it was reasonable to use a fixed-price contract.

Accordingly, the protest is denied.


Deputy Comptroller General
of the United States